DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 687 IR 051 257

AUTHOR Falk, Joyce Duncan
TITLE Survey of Online Searching in the Humanities in Four-Year College and University Libraries.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Irvine. Univ. Library.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 41p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Databases; Higher Education; *Humanities; Information Needs; *Library Research; *Library Services; Library Surveys; *Online Searching; Online Systems

ABSTRACT

College and university librarians were surveyed in May 1984 to assess their experiences and opinions with respect to online searching in the humanities. A questionnaire was mailed to 1,160 4-year college and university libraries in the American Library Directory (1983) that listed an online services coordinator, an enrollment of 1,000 or more, or holdings of 100,000 or more books. Out of 350 (30%) replies, 85 (24% of returns) indicated their institutions had no online searching service. A majority of the 254 replies that contained usable data reported that less than 10% of their searching occurred in the humanities. The most frequently used databases were MLA (Modern Language Association) Bibliography; America: History and Life; and Historical Abstracts. The percentage of humanities database use compared to total online searching was estimated and the seriousness of problems in searching in the humanities was ranked. The most important problems were identified as the limited scope of existing humanities databases and the lack of databases for some fields in the humanities. The study also summarized the impact of online searching in the humanities on other library functions, including bibliographic instruction. The question of a vocabulary of the humanities elicited divided opinion from respondents. The report includes a copy of the questionnaire, 11 tables, and a number of bibliographic references. (Author/THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED261687

SURVEY OF ONLINE SEARCHING IN THE HUMANITIES IN FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES[1]

Joyce Duncan Falk, Ph.D.
Data Services Coordinator
University of California, Irvine

copyright 1985

INTRODUCTION

Scholars and teachers in the humanities are notorious—at least among librarians but also among humanists themselves—for their resistance to using research aids beyond their specialties, for being slow to learn about new research tools, and for eschewing any reliance on others who might know the tools better. The characteristics of research in the humanities described in studies of the information needs and research habits of humanists are also factors in the present state of online searching in the humanities.[2]

Assumptions and generalizations about online searching in the humanities abound, but little research has been done either on theoretical issues or on the opinions of more than a few researchers and search analysts.[3] The humanities have been the last disciplines to develop both databases and audiences for online searching. The lack of urgent need for rapid information retrieval and the lack of financial resources to produce databases and support retrieval systems are largely responsible for this tardiness. Dialog Information Retrieval Service began mounting humanities databases in the late 1970s, but its representatives regularly warn database

IR051257

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joyce Duncan Falk
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

producers and librarian-searchers of the unprofitablity of those databases. Searchers frequently cite lack of research funds by scholars in the humanities as inhibiting their use of online database searching. Other reasons regularly mentioned concern the nature of humanities vocabulary, the inadequacy of databases in the humanities, humanists' reluctance to deal with an intermediary, and distrust of computers.

Before questioning those generalizations we first need some measure of their extent and seriousness among searchers; therefore, the following study was designed to gather information on the extent of database searching in the humanities, on the problems and needs perceived by search analysts, and on any impact of humanities searching on other library functions. This information should be useful to practicing online search analysts, administrators of online search services, academic librarians planning reference and bibliographic instruction programs, and information scientists interested in information retrieval in the humanities. Database producers and online information companies also might give some attention to the findings for improving their products and services.

METHODOLOGY

Assuming that data from a widely distributed questionnaire would be more useful to librarians, vendors, database producers, and researchers than the existing observations of a few of us, however logical and well articulated, I planned a survey of college and university libraries soliciting experience and opinion about online searching in the humanities.

By humanities I mean history, literature, philosophy, religion, the arts (treated historically, critically, or philosophically), interdisciplinary areas including these disciplines, and other disciplines when using frameworks and methodologies similar to the humanities (e.g., linguistics, anthropology, even geography) as opposed to the social sciences. The nine databases I considered humanities ones are America: History and Life (AHL), Artbibliographies Modern (ART), Historical Abstracts (HA), Modern Language Association Bibliography (MLA), Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians (JSAH), Language and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), Philosopher's Index, Religion Index, and RILM Abstracts.

A search of ERIC, Library and Information Science Abstracts, Social Sciences Citation Index, America: History and Life, Historical Abstracts, MLA Bibliography, and Philosopher's Index revealed little material on this topic—mostly descriptions of databases—and nothing of relevance not already known to me. The search missed the one new item that was relevant, Anita Lowry's article in Technicalities.

I constructed a pilot questionnaire and sent it to sixteen searchers (including library school faculty members and service coordinators) who I thought would be interested in this project, to three humanities database producers, and two vendors. Fourteen searchers replied but only ABC-Clio and BRS from the publishers and vendors did. Searchers' replies were so thoughtful and interesting that I was tempted to conclude the project right there. Evidently, though, the effort spent on the pilot questionnaire deterred at least one librarian from participating in the actual survey (because the majority of respondents signed their replies, I could tell by a process of elimination that one major university included in the pilot

questionnaire did not return a "real" one). Based on the trial answers and the additional comments, I revised the questionnaire, a copy of which is appended.

Although much of the data requested on the questionnaires was quantitative and could be statistically analyzed, from the beginning I saw the value of the project not in those terms but for the new ideas, the thoughtful explanations, the lesser known projects, and the additional humanities searchers it might uncover. As I explained to the research proposal reviewers, the non-quantitative responses were of the utmost importance. In fact, I had no interest in a survey that obtained only responses in a pre-ordained and simplified form. The subject of online searching in the humanities is not to the stage of development that merely quantitative analysis of answers to set questions is useful. It is important to bear in mind my intentions as well as the need to avoid giving data an unwarranted aura of scientific validity through extensive statistical analysis.

Progress on the project fell excessively behind schedule, but by the spring of 1984 I thought I was ready to mail the questionnaires so I dated them April 15, asking for return by May 15. Utterly incredible fiascos at the print shop and the casual attitude of the mailing service caused the questionnaires to not be mailed until the middle and second half of May 1984. With the help of a student assistant, copies were sent to all four-year college and university libraries in the American Library Directory (1983) that listed an online services coordinator, an enrollment of 1,000 or more, or holdings of 100,000 or more books. A total of 1160 questionnaires were sent; 350 were returned (30%). Of the 350, 85 (or about 24% of the returns) indicated their institutions had no online searching service. In addition eight questionnaires (2.2%) were returned

by institutions to whom the questionnaire should not have been sent, mostly two-year colleges, a branch library, and a technical library.

Table 1: Number of Questionnaires and Responses

Questionnaires mailed	1160
Questionnaires received with at least some data that could be used in the tally	254
Errors detected	8
Reports of no online searching	85
Replies that declined to answer the questionnaire	3
Total replies 30% of the 1160 sent	350

Of those who declined to reply, one had just begun searching and said their experience was not useful. Another was an unsympathetic response from an uninterested and unimaginative librarian. The third response was one that I can appreciate only too well: the library administration chose to concentrate time and resources on services and could not use them for answering the many surveys received. I suspect many librarians did not answer the questionnaire for the same reason. In fact, it was with some feeling of guilt that I had embarked on this survey, knowing how short of time most of us are. I think all those who conduct surveys would appreciate a candid response like the one I received --even if it were a form letter used routinely by the institution.

ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Question 1: Types of Institutions Represented (Liberal Arts College, University, Other)

This question was not as useful as I had thought it would be because it did not make meaningful distinctions among institutions. It would have been better to ask for the size of the institution in enrollment figures and number of graduate programs. The choice of simply liberal arts, university, or other allowed for only some rather obvious correlations between type of institution, number of searches, and number of patrons in each category. For example, liberal arts colleges often had no graduate student searches and tended to have a higher percent of humanities searches; institutions reporting the highest number of searches were universities. The smaller number of searches at liberal arts colleges compared to universities gave their answers more weight in the tabulations because I did not correlate with or "correct" for number of searches.

Table 2: Types of Colleges and Universities

	Number	%
Liberal arts colleges	101	39.76
Universities	149	58.66
Other Graduate schools - 2 Special (theological) library - 1 Mining and engineering college - 1	4	1.57
Total	254	

Question 2: Total Number of Searches During a Twelve-Month Period

What was surprising was the rather small number of libraries reporting more than 500 searches a year; 73% of the institutions reported less than 500. The question asked for the exact number of complete, intellectual searches

(as opposed to database accesses), although, of course, some responses were an estimate. I grouped the answers into the divisions shown in Table 3. The period used for reporting by the majority of respondents (70%) was the 1983-84 fiscal or academic year; 22% used the 1982-83 year and a few (7%) used the calendar year 1983.

Table 3: Total Number of Searches During a Twelve-Month Period

Number of searches (grouped)	Number of libraries	% of the 254 replies
1-500 searches	186	73%
1-50	25	10%
51-100	41	16%
101-300	97	38%
301-500	23	9%
501-1000	30	12%
1001-	23	9%
Not reported or data not usable	15	6%
Total	254	

Question 3: Number of Connect Hours of Online Database Searching

The total number of online searching hours is another indicator of a library's volume of searching. It can be used to determine the average connect time per search and to compare similar institutions or different times at the same institution. On the questionnaire, although a number of respondents carefully reported this data, it was not included consistently enough to use. Other variables in the counting of searches made it difficult to analyze and draw reliable inferences from the data.

Question 4: Percentage of Online Searches by Category of Patron

Table 4 shows that the majority of libraries did 1-25% of their searches for undergraduates and only 10% did no undergraduate searches. More libraries did a larger percentage of searches for graduate students: 35% of them did 26-50% of their searches for graduate students. The distribution of searches for faculty-staff and graduate students is approximately the same except that only four respondents reported no faculty-staff searches while 40 (17%) had no graduate student searches. The latter is most often because the institution had no graduate students. Searches for off-campus patrons usually (51%) made up 1-10% of the searches, but in many instances (38%) were not done at all.

Table 4: Number and Percent of Libraries Reporting the Percent of Searches in Each Patron Category

Patron category	Percentages of searches (number of libraries/percent of 239)					
	0	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
Undergraduates	25/10%	75/31%	55/23% (1-25% = 54%)	43/18%	33/14%	8/3%
Graduate students	40/17%	28/12%	35/15% (1-25% = 27%)	83/35%	40/17%	13/5%
Faculty and staff	4/2%	25/10%	61/25% (1-25% = 35%)	97/40%	36/15%	16/7%
Off campus	90/38%	122/51%	16/7% (1-25% = 58%)	10/4%	0	1/0%

Total usable responses	239
Data not provided in a usable format	15
Total	254

Among the libraries reporting that more than 10% of their searches were on humanities topics, there was a slight weighting of undergraduate over graduate student search patrons but faculty and staff were still significant. Table 5 shows the distribution, by percent of searches on humanities topics, of the 52 libraries that reported extremes of zero or more than 50% of patrons in any one category.

Table 5: Categories of Patrons at Libraries Reporting More Than 10% of Searches in the Humanities and Zero or More Than 50% of Patrons in One or More Categories

	Percent of searches on humanities topics				
	10-20%	20-30%	30-50%	>50%	Total
Number of libraries	29	12	7	4	52
Patron categories					
0 undergraduates	-	2	3	2	7
>50% undergraduates	11*	4	3	1	19
0 graduate students	11*	6	2	-	19
>50% graduate students	2	1	-	2	5
0 faculty-staff	1	-	-	-	1
>50% faculty-staff	10	5	1	1	17
0 off-campus	18	6	3	2	29
>50% off-campus	-	-	-	-	-

*The 11 libraries with >50% undergraduates are not identical to the 11 with 0 graduate students

Question 5: Libraries or Parts of Libraries Excluded in Answering the Above Questions

Noticeable exclusions at large universities were medical or health sciences, sciences, engineering, and law. A few respondents excluded business and education. Eight mentioned a category of search that I had not included on the questionnaire, internal use (ready reference, demonstrations, administrative purposes, sometimes including interlibrary loan). Five of the eight reported percentages in this category of 17%, 22%, 25%, 32%, and 40%, so the amounts are significant. The data collected in this question was too complicated and inconsistent to be used to adjust or weight reports of the institutions as I had originally had in mind to do.

Question 6: Percent of Searches in the Humanities

It was evident on the questionnaires that some respondents estimated from memory and others did an actual count of the year's searches. It quickly became apparent that the choices of percent allowed on the questionnaire should have been more detailed at the lower end of the scale so that differences between 0, 1%, 5%, etc., could have been distinguished. Of those who who checked the 0-10% category on the questionnaire, nine noted that the actual percent was zero; another nine noted "hardly ever," "very few," or "only a few." Others offered more exact percentages:

1% - 2	4% - 2	7% - 2
2% - 1	less than 5% - 2	9% - 1
3% - 2	about 5% - 2	10% - 3

Twelve respondents explained that their searches were primarily in other fields (the sciences, management, nursing, education, psychology, engineering) or that their institutions had no graduate programs or courses in the humanities (3). Additional related comments follow question 7.

Table 6: Number/Percent of Libraries Reporting Percent of Searches in the Humanities (N=254)

0	1-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-50%	>50%	N/A or unusable
9/ 3.5%	170/ 67%	42/ 16.5%	15/ 6%	9/ 3.5%	7/ 2.7%	2

Question 7: Rank of Usage of Humanities Databases

Of the 254 questionnaires, 25 lacked answers or the answers were not usable, leaving a total of 229 questionnaires for the tally of rankings of use of the nine databases in Table 7. Respondents sometimes ranked only some of the databases, gave the same rank to more than one database, or interpreted the question as a request for assignment of each database to a scale. I did not attempt to correct the numbers and used them as they were given. Questionnaires with no markings and ones with only check marks were counted as "no answer or not usable."

Comments included six instances of no usage of any of the listed databases and an additional eight instances of very little or almost no use. The lack of knowledge of JSAH was obvious, even among BRS users. Eight respondents specifically mentioned the severe limitation of BRS

with only Religion Index, LLBA, and JSAH available (however, most did not mention JSAH, even in this context, and BRS dropped JSAH in 1984). See the comments at Question 10 on the inadequacy of databases.

Table 7: Summary of Rankings of the Databases

Database	overall (n=229)		more than 10% humanities (n=73)		more than 1000 total searches (n=23)	
	number times ranked	avg. rank	number times ranked	avg. rank	number times ranked	avg. rank
MLA	206	3.17	71	2.58	21	2.96
AHL	192	3.5	63	3.34	23	2.22
HA	188	4.4	63	3.71	21	4.52
LLBA	158	6.07	50	6.71	18	5.56
Philosopher's Index	151	6.45	51	6.49	17	6.17
Religion Index	140	6.94	53	6.23	19	6.30
ART	140	7.07	50	6.74	19	5.96
RILM	128	7.9	46	7.73	16	7.39
JSAH	105	9.25	37	9.1	15	8.78

The average rankings were calculated by adding the numbers assigned to the particular database including a 10 for every time that database was not selected (ranked). For example, in the overall rankings, MLA's score came to 497; added to it was 230 for the 23 times MLA was not ranked at all; the total of 727 was divided by 229 (the number of usable replies), to equal 3.17 average rank.

The summary of the rank of databases by libraries reporting more than 10% of searches in the humanities included a total of 75 respondents minus two who gave no rankings, for a usable number of 73. It is important to remember that in this tabulation, every institution carried the same weight, regardless of the total number of searches done. For example, two libraries that checked the 50% or more category had done only 10 and 15 searches each, and one had used only three databases. Two of the over-10% group searched only BRS so had used only three of the databases. Two respondents included education in their interpretation of the humanities and therefore reached the 30-50% and 50%-or-more categories.

Among the libraries reporting more than 1,000 searches, only three were also in one of the more-than-10% humanities searches category and all three checked the 10-20% humanities searches choice. It was evident that one of the three had included ready reference searches in the total, and it is likely that several more libraries would have fallen into both groups if they had included ready reference searches. In most cases, however, it was not apparent whether or not ready reference searches had been included in the count.

The top three databases, MLA, AHL, and HA, held practically the same positions regardless of which group of respondents are considered, and there is not much difference in the average rank of the databases. Only in the more-than-1,000-searches group did MLA and AHL exchange first and second positions. The last two positions were also consistently held by RILM and JSAH. The middle ground was shared by LLBA, Philosopher's Index, Religion, and Art, in various positions four to seven. These raw figures probably come as no surprise. One library may use Religion Index frequently whereas another has more call for Art or RILM, but in most places, MLA,

AHL, and HA are the humanities workhorses. From both the figures and the comments, JSAH is clearly at the bottom and needs help getting its availability known.

Question 8: Which Other Databases Are Used for Searches on Humanities Topics?

As shown in Table 8, and true to expectations, DAI, ERIC, and Magazine Index head the list of most used databases. Indeed, in my own tally of humanities searches at the University of California, Irvine, Magazine Index placed second only to MLA. Other respondents occasionally noted that one of these other databases was used more for humanities searches than any of the humanities databases. Use of some of these other databases, as well as comments at question 10, indicate that librarians are groping for access to literature on topics in dance, film, theatre, and women studies, among other multidisciplinary topics. In addition to the databases listed in Table 8, 25 more were noted one to four times on the questionnaires.

Table 8: Other Databases Used for Humanities Topics

Dissertation Abstracts	69	Sociological Abstracts	12
ERIC	56	Public Affairs Information Service	9
Magazine Index	42	Books in Print	7
Social SciSearch	33	Book Review Index	5
PsycInfo	21	Biography Master Index	5
LC MARC, REMARC	18	Library & Information Science Abstracts	5
Newsearch, National Newspaper Index	17		

Question 9: Online Retrieval Systems Used

One of the most serious roadblocks to comprehensive online searching in the humanities is the split between BRS and Dialog subscribers. The vast majority of online searching in the humanities is done on Dialog (Table 9), which is no surprise. Those institutions that use exclusively Dialog constitute the largest number of users. Those who use only BRS are smaller in number but the impact on humanities searching is disastrous. Very few institutions indicated a balanced load between BRS and Dialog (falling into the 26-75% divisions); wherever both systems are available, Dialog is the clear choice--because, of course, that is where the databases are.

Table 9: Percentage of Searches on Humanities Topics per Information Retrieval System

Number/percent of respondents (n=238) by percent of use

System	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-99%	100%
Dialog	7/ 3%	6/ 3%	11/ 5%	16/ 7%	54/ 23%	124/ 52%
	1-25% = 5%					
BRS	32/ 13%	27/ 11%	16/ 7%	7/ 3%	8/ 3%	19/ 8%
	1-25% = 25%					
Other: ERIC						1/ -
SDC	1/ -					
NLM	2/1%					
RLIN			1/ -	1 -"heavy use," no % given		
Unnamed	6/3%					

Question 10: Problems of Online Searching in the Humanities

Table 10 shows the quantification of opinion about the problems of online searching but the comments are more revealing. On problem a., the nature of the humanities or the language used, there was a sharp difference of opinion. An excellent, concise statement of the problem is in Lowry's "A Consumer's Report on Humanities Databases." Forty-two percent of the questionnaire respondents ranked this problem 1 or 2 on the scale of importance and repeated the accepted litany about the humanities. At least ten pointed out that terminology is ambiguous, imprecise, vague, broad, flowery, and allusive; four others mentioned the non-specific, unreliable titles of works in the humanities while another three singled out topics sought by undergraduates as being too vague, general, and interdisciplinary, and demonstrating a lack of understanding of topics' relationship to the disciplines. Only a couple of respondents noted problems having to do with foreign language terms or transliterations. The need for controlled vocabulary and thesauri was mentioned here a few times but came up more frequently in relation to the problem of user aids and the problem of the inadequacy of databases.

On the other hand, 32% of the respondents considered the problem of the discipline or language relatively unimportant (rank 4 or 5). Rather middle-of-the-road observations were that the terminology is less precise than in the sciences but that it is not a serious problem; it is no more a problem than in the social sciences (three specifically noted this point); it is less a problem than in the social sciences and sciences; it varies depending on the topic; and because searchers have backgrounds in the humanities, it is no problem.

Table 10: Number/Percent of Respondents Ranking Each Problem

Question	N=	Scale: most important----------least important 1	2	3	4	5	Avg. rank
a. nature of the discipline, language	201	44/22%	40/20%	53/26%	29/14%	35/17%	2.5
			1+2 = 42%			4+5 = 32%	
b. user aids	198	24/12%	56/28%	54/27%	34/17%	30/15%	2.9
			1+2 = 40%			4+5 = 32%	
c. inadequacy of databases	209	112/54%	45/22%	32/15%	12/6%	8/4%	1.85
			1+2 = 75%			4+5 = 10%	
d. searchers' lack of experience	201	22/11%	29/14%	35/17%	49/24%	66/33%	3.53
			1+2 = 25%			4+5 = 57%	
e. expense of the database	204	18/9%	42/21%	44/22%	42/21%	58/28%	3.39
			1+2 = 29%			4+5 = 49%	
f. lack of need in humanities	202	56/28%	29/14%	46/23%	20/10%	51/25%	2.9
			1+2 = 42%			4+5 = 35%	
g. other	3	1	1	1			2.

Stronger statements included five that explicitly rejected the myth of humanities language and concepts being less precise than or different from that of other fields. One person attributed this widely held notion to a "lingering ignorance and antipathy toward computers among humanities researchers" that is not countered by knowledgeable librarians. Although I do not believe antipathy toward computers is the main root of views about online searching in the humanities, I have long been skeptical of the cliche about the "soft" language of the humanities in comparison with the sciences (since 1977 when I reviewed the literature on natural-language indexing for a presentation at NFAIS); so I was glad to find some company among other online searchers.

A couple of other comments were directed toward the state of computer systems, which have not yet been developed to adquately come to grips with retrieval in the humanities. Rigorous research by information scientists on the language and particular characteristics of the humanities is badly needed to dispel the myths about the humanities—if, indeed, they are myths—and to design retrieval systems better able to handle the language and concepts of the humanities.

Perceptions about problem b., user aids, were similarly divided but had an overall rank of lesser importance than the preceding problem; only 12% considered it very important. Comments ranged from complimentary (Religion Index thesaurus) and satisfactory (adequate, available, not needed) to a desire for better system aids and more database specific aids, to rather strident complaints. One respondent suggested that user aids are difficult to develop because they just cannot cover all the individualistic aspects in humanities topics. Three people commented that they could not afford the aids for seldom used humanities databases.

A few comments revealed a lack of knowledge of what is available. There were calls for the improvement of the BRS manual in general, especially its indexing, and of the Dialog bluesheets, especially on matters of spacing, punctuation, and personal name searching. MLA was mentioned most frequently (five times) as needing both search aids and better Dialog documentation, although one irritated searcher wrote that "no aid can salvage MLA." An additional ten replies called for more thesauri in general and five more specifically requested one for MLA. This question of thesauri is related to the language of the disciplines and is further discussed under problem e., inadequacy of the databases. Most comments at this point seemed not to reflect any particular thought given to the issue of controlled vocabulary indexing in the humanities. One respondent, however, noted that the idiosyncratic nature of research in the humanities makes the development of standardized indexing—thesauri—almost impossible.

All in all, except for need for help with MLA, the lack or inadequacy of user aids did not appear to be a major consideration in searching the humanities databases.

Problem c., inadequacy of the databases, generated the highest rank of importance: 54% ranked it 1, very important; 75% ranked it 1 or 2 in importance. It also generated the most comments and the most complaints. The largest number of comments (55 respondents) called for more databases or expansion of the databases to cover more subjects. Table 11 summarizes the expressions of need for expansion of coverage.

Table 11: Need for Expansion of Humanities Databases

Need more databases		19
Need general or interdisciplinary ones		9
Need specific databases or databases in specific areas		27
Ancient history, literature, and archaeology	7	
Medieval studies	3	
Dance, theatre, drama	9	
Music	4	
Art (broader, earlier)	11	
Architecture, design	3	
Film	5	
Arts & Humanities Citation Index	10	
Wilson indexes	2	
Number of specifics (in 27 replies)	54	

Some related comments emphasized the need for Religion Index on Dialog (four instances), the lack of coverage of theatre and drama criticism, and the very serious problem of BRS having so few humanities databases (eight comments).

The next most frequent comment (28 instances) concerned the need for the databases to be more retrospective and to include earlier literature. Time and again respondents blamed the limited quantity of online searching on the fact that the databases are limited to only recent material.

The need for more frequent updates of the files or the problem of files not being current enough were cited 20 times. Of those 20, seven mentioned RILM specifically and eight mentioned MLA.

Dissatisfaction with the indexing of several files was voiced, sometimes in a tantalizingly cryptic or blunt manner as a result of the questionnaire format. These remarks included three references to the poor subject access to Dissertation Abstracts, references to "dirty" and unreliable indexing in Religion Index, and the note that LLBA is "just strange."

Comments on the history databases, AHL and HA, centered on the need for easier time-period searching (five instances) and better indexing (three instances). One of the latter said simply, history indexing is "bad," while another requested controlled vocabulary--for example, the indexing of general categories of things like bridges, temples, and fortifications (it is not clear whether the respondent meant instead of or in addition to the specific indexing that is present).

The most numerous (16) and emphatic complaints were about MLA, and here it was not always clear that the remarks were about the new indexing as well as the old. Specifically noted were the lack of access points or the lack of data (indexing or otherwise) on which to search and the lack of ability to search by form and for relationships. Indexing was characterized as "terribly inadequate," "still inadequate for concepts," "too broad," "shallow," and "absurd." Unfortunately the questionnaire answers did not usually reveal a recognition of the distinction between the two indexing schemes. The new indexing system is surely an improvement and probably takes care of many of these complaints, but a few responses seemed to indicate dissatisfaction with the new scheme as well. Although part of the problem is the terseness of questionnaire answers, part of it is the time lag in librarians' knowledge of indexes--five years after Historical Abstracts and America: History and Life changed to an entirely

new and different indexing scheme I was still getting comments from librarians unaware of the change!

Another issue mentioned a number of times in the responses but one that could be addressed only superficially in a questionnaire is that of vocabulary control. The assumption that a controlled vocabulary is a "good thing" appeared to be uncritically accepted by the majority of those who mentioned it. This issue is too complex to deal with here and, like the language of the humanities, needs genuine research.

Anita Lowry of Columbia University articulated an observation that I suspect many of us operate on: the better the printed index in terms of organization, coverage, indexing, currency, and ease of use, the less interest there is in using the online database. Dissertation Abstracts, Social Scisearch, and MLA are among the heavily used databases because even though searching them online is problematical, it is often more productive or less difficult than using the printed index. To students on a limited budget and with a well-defined topic, I recommend a manual search of AHL or Philosopher's Index and online access to those indexes that have less thorough indexing or a cumbersome organization.

On problem d., searchers' lack of experience, the majority thought it was relatively unimportant (57%), with a full one-third of respondents rating it as of least importance. This opinion is contrary to my own experience in talking with searchers about the humanities databases. Also, I occasionally noted on a questionnaire that this problem was ranked 5 (unimportant) but other answers revealed a lack of knowledge of the databases or a lack of experience searching them.

Two people commented that the databases presented no unusual problems and three others said their searchers had strong skills in the humanities,

so had no problems. In contrast to what I think is the usual assumption, one person stated that the humanities more than other fields require in-depth knowledge of the subject areas to be proficient at searching. A number of respondents (11) pointed out that they lacked experience because there was little demand for searching in the humanities; one noted that BRS introductory training is inadequate and another that Dialog training was rarely available in the area.

Sooner or later we have to face problem e., money. Almost half (49%) of the respondents did not believe expense was an important factor in searching in the humanities and this "problem" got next to the lowest average rank. While a number of respondents recognized that the humanities databases are among the least expensive or are reasonably priced, a few thought they are expensive compared to ERIC, Chemical Abstracts, or Science Citation Index. Files specifically singled out as too expensive were not humanities databases: Dissertation Abstracts, LC MARC, and Marquis Who's Who. One snappy observation was that "to some people anything is too much" and another simply that "all information is expensive."

Those who thought expense was of some importance frequently cited the lack of funding available to humanities researchers and undergraduates (13 times). Others went on to explain that the costs are too high in relation to the value received; the databases are not comprehensive, are difficult and time-consuming to manipulate (four responses along this line), or are high priced for information that patrons can get fairly easily by hand.

Problem f., the lack of need for online searching in the humanities, could be interpreted as ultimate need or current demand. Many respondents

interpreted the problem as one of lack of demand for searching and consequently rated this problem as important (42% ranked it 1 or 2). Fourteen replies mentioned that the curricula at their institutions emphasized other subjects or lacked humanities programs. Another 11 noted that printed indexes and books were adequate for their students and faculty or that topics were easy enough to search manually. Other respondents (nine) noted characteristics of study in the humanities that are not handled by online searching: the use of books, manuscripts, archival material, and retrospective bibliographies that are not online; the lack of need for thorough, comprehensive searching--but others cited the inability of online searching to be comprehensive and reliable; and the lack of need for current material. Seventeen said there is a need but the databases are inadequate--one of the most frequently made comments.

Of those who considered this "problem" not of central importance, ten noted that there definitely is a need, a strong interest, even a steady demand. Some of these and others (22 in all) said there is a need but there is lack of perceived need, lack of awareness, and lack of knowledge about the availability of online searching and what its specific benefits are. The frustration of librarians was apparent in their descriptions of the inertia among humanists; the ignorance of professors about even existing printed tools; and faculty members' preference for serendipity (browsing, casual reading and conversations), a network of personal contacts, and reading only selected materials to precision or thoroughness in their library research. While one respondent observed "We promote like hell but they don't come (except for MLA)," others still urged education and suggested that promotion and bibliographic instruction for faculty emphasize the capabilities and advantages of online searching

over traditional means. Graduate students are a better audience both because they seem to have a real need for extensive searches--hence are a present market--and because they are more open to learning about tools and techniques--hence they will be a continuing and future market.

Problem g., intended to identify problems that had not occurred to me, elicited none that were not related to one of the a.-f. problems. One discouraging comment made about the inadequacy of databases perhaps belongs better here: database producers do not seem to care about online searching. MLA is updated only once a year; AHL has duplicate entries. I could elaborate on both sides of this statement: some database producers do care--and cite examples of what they have done as well as the reasons for not doing more; or, it is true, database producers do not care enough--and cite examples of what is feasible for them to do--some other time! A related comment was that we need a way to make vendors and database producers aware of the market so they will address the problems--again, a point that needs elaboration.

An observation along a different line, and one I am surprised was mentioned only once, was the possible conflict between a researcher's independence and direct control of his or her work and the way online database searching is done. The need to consult an intermediary and rely on an unseen file of data in a mysterious computer may be an impediment to researchers in the humanities who want to do their own work and do not trust any of it to someone else. But this point, too, has its converse. I often see faculty members send assistants or even secretaries to the library to do literature searching. I also find that I--the intermediary--am more careful, conscientious, and sometimes even more knowledgeable than the researchers themselves. So, although as a humanities researcher

myself, I might not trust an intermediary or an unknown machine, I am not sure how many others feel that way, much less how justified it is. More solid data on research methods and habits would be useful here, although as we train graduate students who join the ranks of researchers, this impediment should go away.

Question 11: Bibliographic Instruction

The question asked did not have a direct relationship to the humanities but would, I thought, have some bearing on experience with searching the humanities. Besides, I was (am) interested in finding out to what extent online searching is integrated into bibliographic instruction and how it was being done. The question, however, fell between two stools: on the one hand it was not specifically related to the humanities, the focus of the questionnaire, and on the other hand it was not structured to gather data on the various aspects of bibliographic instruction in online searching.

Of the 242 replies to this question, 173 indicated that online database searching was included in their bibliographic instruction programs, 69 that is was not. Eleven of the "yes" answers gave no information at all on how it was done or sounded like they merely explained it to individual patrons, not as part of a bibliographic instruction program. Another 12 said it was included in general library orientations, tours, or general library handouts--again, not really qualifying as bibliographic instruction as I had thought of it. Discounting these 23 "yes" answers, about 62% of those answering the question (or 59% of the total usable questionnaires) provided some description of bibliographic instruction. Nineteen described a brief, minimum inclusion of online searching in sessions on the library by mentioning it, referring students to a librarian, or listing it on a

bibliography; 58 described a more extensive presentation including handouts, slides, sample searches, and sometimes demonstrations. Sometimes the online component was included only for upper division or graduate students, for certain subject areas, or upon request. In three instances a demonstration was followed by a free or subsidized search and in three other cases students were assigned to do a search (in one case the academic department paid for them). Three libraries included online searching in an undergraduate course on library use and four had instruction in online searching separate from the regular bibliographic instruction classes. The answers to this completely open-ended question were so varied that it was difficult to group them and make any meaningful or accurate tabulations, but my attempt to summarize the answers could provide the basis for designing a questionnaire on this activity.

A somewhat disturbing note was struck in two replies that indicated denying or rationing online searching so students would learn to use the printed indexes. In one case freshmen and sophomores were not encouraged to use the service and in another the English department reportedly wanted the students to use traditional library materials. I think they have nothing to fear—anyone in the humanities must learn to use the printed or "traditional" tools because little of the necessary material is online. As much as we all want students to learn to use the printed library tools, it is short-sighted and artificial, I believe, to try to accomplish that by keeping them ignorant of current technology and conveniences. I would instead emphasize the complementary relationship of manual and online searching: 1) online searching complements, does not substitute for, other library resources and 2) knowledge of the printed indexes enables one to make the best use of the online versions.

Question 12: Impact on Other Library Services or Functions

This question, divided into two questions on collection development and one open-ended one to discover areas not typical or obvious to me, focused on humanities online searching, but I suspect many respondents generalized to online searching as a whole, although a few noted that their answers would be different if the question were not limited to humanities searching.

Impact of searching on development of the general collection was perceived by 17 of those 237 replying to this question (about 7%, or 6.7% of the 254 total questionnaires). They mentioned upgrading the periodicals collection and either focusing on certain subject areas or broadening the scope of selection of materials.

The impact on reference collection development was more noticeable. Fifty-one respondents noted some effect (21.5% of the 237 replies or 20% of the total 254 questionnaires), primarily on the cancellation or non-selection of printed indexes available online. Six instances of cancellation of MLA surprised me because of the high use and relatively low cost of that bibliography. Cancellations of AHL (five) and HA (six) might be more understandable in terms of expense, but nevertheless disappointing. Other indexes listed once each as cancelled were Philosopher's Index, Biography Master Index, and Dissertation Abstracts. Nine more said they had cancelled one or more subscriptions to abstracts and indexes without saying which ones, and six were considering cancelling some. Eight reported they did not purchase one or more indexes that are online; five more said they were considering not purchasing certain indexes, cumulative indexes, or new editions of reference works like American Men and Women of Science.

On the other hand, larger institutions and even some smaller ones objected to the idea of cancelling printed indexes. At larger schools the number of patrons (usage) requires the printed indexes. Comments included recognition that printed tools are a vital part of students' education, that online systems are to supplement access not limit it, and that databases do not yet have the depth or comprehensiveness to affect selection or cancellation of printed works. Three people said they were more likely to cancel indexes in the sciences than in the humanities.

More replied yes to the question of impact on other services or functions than to that on reference collection (65 or 29%, or 26% of the total). As was expected, a large number of the yes replies noted the impact on interlibrary loan (47 or 72% of the yes replies); 34 mentioned it, 13 more said the impact had been substantial, enormous, drastic, etc. A couple noted that because of the large size of the institution, no effect could be noticed. Six respondents saw an increase in awareness of and demand for library services and materials; an increase in faculty and student knowledge of abstracts and indexes, including ones not online; enhanced research ability of faculty and graduate students; and improved image of the library. Several instances of impact on reference service were mentioned: more demand for desk service, more or improved ready reference, closer relationship with patrons, and improvement of librarians' skills through review of new databases and discussion of print and online tools. On the neutral or negative side were comments about the fact that searching takes up a lot of librarians' time, acquiring and maintaining skills takes up more time, more time is spent finding materials for students, and there are fewer desk hours for searching librarians.

One "horror story" appeared, too: the use of online searching (presumably Social Scisearch, but conceivably tapes of Arts & Humanities Citation Index from ISI) to find the number of citations to an author's works and determine the strength of candidates for employment in humanities positions. Anyone who uses citation indexes ought to know their limitations and pitfalls better than to countenance such a misuse.

Question 13: Projects or Experiments in Humanities Online Searching

Several respondents sent copies of their promotional and instructional literature. Three libraries had given faculty workshops specifically in the humanities (University of California, Berkeley, Lehigh University, and Oakland University), and Simone Klugman sent materials from her workshop at Berkeley in 1982. Three more cited general workshops or programs that included some humanities content. Joyce Wilder-Jones of California State University, Fullerton, reminded me of her experiment in teaching online searching to graduate students in history, which I should follow up on. In November 1984, I gave a half-day seminar, sponsored by the University of California Data Services Coordinators, on searching the humanities databases. Linda De Fato noted the research grant she and Anne Leibold had had at Arizona State University. Their work, which I was already aware of and which is one of the few examples of actual research in this area, is reported by Anne Leibold (note 3). Anita Lowry sent me a copy of her article, "A Consumer's Report on Humanities Databases" (note 3), which had escaped my own search net. She also sent extensive comments on the questionnaire and mentioned her forthcoming work on the FRANCIS-H database.

CONCLUSION

As intended, the survey gathered opinions and reports of experience with online searching in the humanities from a respectable number of librarians from a variety of four-year colleges and universities. The focus of the analysis is on the comments and observations. Although a few correlations of data would have been valid and useful, I purposely avoided analysis that might attribute "scientific" characteristics to data that does not merit it.

The most rewarding part of the project was the interchange with the selected search analysts who reviewed the pilot questionnaire and those respondents who gave fulsome explanations of their answers on the questionnaire.

About 60% of the institutions represented were universities and 40% were liberal arts colleges--but a "university" today can have a quite limited program and small enrollment, so this breakdown does not tell us much. The survey confirmed that the impressions I had identified about humanities online searching were widely but not universally believed. There were few surprises; in fact, not even all the points already noted in the literature on the subject appeared in the questionnaire responses. The total number of searches done per year was less than I had expected; a quarter of the libraries reported less than 100 searches a year and 64% reported up to 300 a year; only 21% reported more than 500 searches a year. Faculty and graduate students still account for the largest number of searches but undergraduates are by no means neglected.

The number of humanities searches was predictably low, but the data collected was not detailed enough to go beyond broad generalizations. The majority (67%) of the respondents indicated their humanities searches

were only 1-10% of the total searches performed in a year. Libraries reporting more than 10% of their searches in the humanities were more likely to have a preponderance of undergraduate or faculty-staff patrons than of graduate student patrons.

The most frequently used systems and databases were no surprise, either. Dialog practically has a monopoly on the humanities databases. Just as Dialog was securing its position as offering all the humanities databases by finally getting Religion Index online (June 1985), BRS finally got Arts and Humanities Citation Index. This perpetuates the unfortunate split—unfortunate for the librarian who has access to only one of these two systems.

MLA was used by the most libraries and earned the highest rank of usage by the total number of those answering the questionnaire, followed by AHL. There was little difference between the rank of these two top databases among the total respondents but among those doing more than 10% of their searches in the humanities, MLA had a significantly higher rank (2.58 compared to AHL's 3.34 in a 1-9 ranking). There was a clear separation between the top three databases (MLA, AHL, and HA), and the middle group (LLBA, Philosopher's Index, Religion Index, and ART), and again between the middle group and the lowest ranked databases, RILM and JSAH.

Other databases used for searching humanities topics were led by Dissertation Abstracts, and ERIC came in second, ahead of Magazine Index. After that, Social Scisearch appeared to be a frequent fall-back file; and PsycInfo was an unexpected fifth in popularity. Other social science and current affairs files followed LC MARC and REMARC. In all, 39

databases were listed at least once as having been used for searches in the humanities.

The survey confirmed that a large number of librarians (42% of respondents) believe the nature of the language used in the humanities is a significant problem in online searching, but no new or unusual examples of problems related to the nature of the humanities research were offered. Almost one-third of the respondents viewed the question as not very important. The difference of opinion was revealed more in the comments than in the numbers; a few persons overtly challenged the notion that the humanities' language is "different" and others pointed to the need for improvement of retrieval systems. The questionnaire elicited only brief generalizations or quick characterizations--what is needed is research on language in the humanities and the design of more effective retrieval systems.

Opinion on user aids was, statistically, about the same as on the nature of the humanities (40% important, 32% not). The desire for thesauri was expressed by about 7.5% of the respondents to this question, but there was a worrisome lack of any recognition of what is involved in thesauri development and use.

The one problem on which there was a clear majority both numerically (75%) and in the intensity of the comments was the inadequacy of the databases in subject matter and in years of literature available online. Here questions about language or vocabulary, thesauri, and indexing merged. "Better indexing" was a common request, but just what was meant by that was not explained. Controlled vocabulary was also requested, but again, in brief and general terms with no particular insights, so this question, too, awaits research.

MLA received the most criticism, but that is partly because it was the most frequently used database. The lack of attention given to the humanities by the information industry was widely noted. We have to be grateful to Dialog for making the databases available, even though they practically have a monopoly on the humanities and sometimes seem not to care about them. Ironically, the Dialog representative did not bother to respond to the announcement of my survey project and pilot questionnaire, nor did two of the three database producers to whom it was sent.

By and large, the surveyed librarians did not agree with me that their lack of knowledge and experience searching the humanities databases was a problem. Although a few simply indicated that they considered the humanities databases expensive, more perceptive comments pointed to the increase in cost due to file structures that caused inefficient searching and to the lack of comprehensiveness, hence lack of value, of many searches. Librarians appeared to believe that the lack of research funds in the humanities is a very real obstacle to use of online searching.

The expression of opinion about the lack of need for online searching in the humanities was more divided than the figures indicate (42% important, 35% not so important). Many saw the "problem" as a lack of demand--their patrons were not working in the humanities or did not ask for online searching. Those who said there is a need--some emphatically so--noted the lack of <u>perceived</u> need among humanists and the drawback of the inadequate coverage of the humanities online.

Online searching was included in regular bibliographic instruction in more than 50% of the schools. In most cases the online component is not extensive; only about one-third of the cited programs included

demonstrations. No one mentioned the effect of online public catalogs on patrons' understanding or use of online searching.

Only a few librarians had detected any impact of humanities online searching on general collection development. About 20% saw some effect on reference collection, especially on cancelling or not buying abstracts and indexes. Other effects were improvements in reference service, but also the requirement of much time to learn and maintain skills.

Although the survey did not turn up many projects in the humanities, it identified a few more kindred spirits in humanities searching, some examples of faculty workshops in the humanities, and an end-user training project in history.

This analysis of questionnaires has verified and to some extent codified existing attitudes, perceptions, and opinion about searching in the humanities among a cross-section of those people actively engaged in online searching in settings in which the humanities are important. Notwithstanding efforts of the Modern Language Association, the Library of Congress, and ABC-Clio (and presumably others) to consult their constituencies and efforts by database producers, vendors, and library schools to inform librarians about database construction and economics, there is a serious gap in librarians' knowledge of the humanities databases and what measures are feasible to improve them. On the one hand database producers seem not to care enough to make some quite feasible improvements; on the other hand, librarians seem to lack an understanding of the mechanics, intellectual complexity, and economic realities of database production.

This survey together with the literature on the information needs and research habits of humanists (note 2), has provided the background

and established the need for further research on information retrieval in the humanities. While some obvious practical improvements in the databases are needed immediately (standardization of file structure and indexing within a single database, elimination of duplicate and faulty entries, provision of lists of index terms used, extension of coverage backwards, and more current files), the larger questions of better indexing, controlled vocabulary, construction of thesauri, and development of more extensive databases require both research and financing.

NOTES

1. Work on this project was assisted by an award from the Research Grant Program for Librarians, University of California, Irvine, 1983-1985.

2. Without summarizing that literature here, notable examples are: Dagmar Horna Perman, "Bibliography and the Historian," Bibliography and the Historian: The Conference at Belmont (Santa Barbara, CA: Clio, 1968): 7-19. Lois Bebout, Donald Davis, Jr., and Donald Oehlerts, "User Studies in the Humanities: A Survey and a Proposal," RQ 15 (1975): 40-44. Information Problems in the Humanities: A Report on the British Library Seminar, British Library Research and Development Reports 5259 (Boston Spa, England: The British Library Lending Division, 1976). Peter A. Uva, Information-gathering Habits of Academic Historians: Report of the Pilot Study (Syracuse, NY: State University of New York Upstate Medical Center Library, 1977). Cynthia Corkill and Margaret Mann, Information Needs in the Humanities: Two Postal Surveys, CRUS Occasional Paper 2, British Library Research and Development Department Report 5455 (Sheffield, England: University of Sheffield, 1978). Eugene Garfield, "Is Information Retrieval in the Arts and Humanities

Inherently Different from That in Science? . . . ," Library Quarterly 50 (1980) 40-57. Sue Stone, ed., Humanities Information Research: Proceedings of a Seminar; Sheffield 1980, CRUS Occasional Paper 4, British Library and Development Department Report 5588 (Sheffield, England: University of Sheffield, 1980). Margaret F. Stieg, "The Information Needs of Historians," College and Research Libraries 42 (1981): 549-560. Madeleine Stern, "Characteristics of the Literature of Literary Scholarship," College and Research Libraries 44 (1983): 199-209. Sue Stone, "Humanities Scholars: Information Needs and Users," Journal of Documentation, 38 (1982): 292-313.

3. See the research reported by Anne Leibold, "Bibliographic Data Bases in the Humanities: A Performance Study," in Sarah K. Burton and Douglas D. Short, eds., Sixth International Conference on Computers and the Humanities (Rockville, MD: Computer Science Press, 1983): 368-382, and the discussions by Anita Lowry, "A Consumer's Report on Humanities Databases," Technicalities 2 (August 1982): 1-3, 11-12; Eileen M. Mackesy, "A Perspective on Secondary Access Services in the Humanities," Journal of the American Society for Information Science 33 (May 1982): 146-151 (humanities in a narrow sense, excluding history); Scott D. Stebelman, "Online Searching and the Humanities: Relevance, Resistance, and Marketing Strategies," in Martha E. Williams and Thomas H. Hogan, comp., National Online Meeting Proceedings, 1981 (Medford, NJ: Learned Information, Inc., 1981): 443-453. Some of the points in these articles are also noted in ones on more specific aspects of online searching, e.g., Joyce Duncan Falk, "Searching by Historical Period in the History Databases," in National Online Meeting Proceedings, 1981, ibid., 199-205; Chris D. Ferguson, "The Librarian-Historian Interface in Reference Service," RQ 21 (1982): 356-360; and Evelyn-Margaret Kiresen and Simone Klugman, "The Use of Online Databases for Historical Research," RQ 21 (1982): 342-351.

SURVEY:

ONLINE SEARCHING IN THE HUMANITIES AT FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

This questionnaire is intended to survey searching by all searchers within an institution (see question 5). To answer some of the questions, the respondent may have to consult other searchers. "Humanities" here means the arts and humanities and related interdisciplinary studies, such as literature, history, philosophy, religion, art history, music history, and other disciplines treated historically or philosophically. If exact figures are not available, please estimate to the best of your ability.

1. To which of the following categories does your library belong?

   Liberal arts college . . . . . _____
   University . . . . . _____
   Other - specify: _____ . . _____

2. Total number of online searches (subject, "intellectual," or complete searches, not database accesses) at your library during the last 12-month period for which you have records. . . . . _____
   Period on which you are reporting _____

3. Total number of connect hours of searching online databases during the same 12-month period used in question 2, excluding cataloging utilities and online catalogs. _____

4. What percent of your online-search patrons belong to the following categories:

   Undergraduates at your institution . . . _____
   Graduate students at your institution . . _____
   Faculty and staff at your institution . . _____
   Off-campus _____

5. If the above figures are not the total for your institution, indicate the limitations:

   Main or general library only? . . . . _____
   Other combination or exclusions? . . . _____

   Explain combinations or exclusions: _____
   _____

6. Approximately what percent of your online searches are on humanities topics?

   0 - 10% _____
   10 - 20% _____
   20 - 30% _____
   30 - 50% _____
   more than 50% _____

   Comments: _____
   _____
   _____

7. Rank the following humanities databases 1-9 in order of frequency of use, using 1 to mean most frequent:

America: History and Life	_____	MLA Bibliography	_____
ARTbibliographies Modern	_____	Philosopher's Index	_____
Historical Abstracts	_____	Religion Index	_____
Language & Language Behavior Abstracts	_____	RILM	_____
		JSAH	_____

Comments: _____
_____
_____

8. Which other databases do you use for searches on humanities topics?

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

9. Approximately what percentage of your searches on humanities topics are done on each of the online retrieval systems:

Dialog . . . . . _____

BRS . . . . . _____

Other . . . . . _____

10. Rank each of the following problems of humanities online searching on a scale of 1-5, using 1 to mean very important (troublesome, in need of attention) and 5 to mean of least importance. Please add comments to clarify or amplify your interpretation of the problem and significance. Rank 1-5

a. Nature of the discipline or its language _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

b. User aids (lack of aids, quality of aids) _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

c. Inadequacy of the databases (scope of existing ones; lack of coverage of some fields, etc.) _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

d. Searchers' lack of experience _____

Comments: _____

_____

e. Expense of the databases _____

Comments: _____

_____

f. Lack of need for online searching in the humanities _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

g. Other - please specify _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Yes or no

11. Does your bibliographic instruction program include online database searching (yes or no)? _____

If yes, how is online database searching presented? (Attach additional sheet if needed.)

_____
_____
_____
_____

12. Has online searching in the humanities had any impact on:
(Answer yes or no, then explain)

Collection development of the general collection _____

_____
_____

Collection development in Reference (e.g., selection or cancellation of printed indexes) _____

_____
_____
_____

Other library services or functions _____

_____
_____
_____

13. Have you had any projects or experiments related to searching in the humanities that you would be willing to share with the author of this questionnaire? If so, please briefly describe the experience and add the name and address of the person with whom to communicate: _____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

14. The following information might be needed for a request for further information. No respondent will be identified without specific written permission.
Optional: Name, address and phone number of person completing this questionnaire:

_____
_____
_____
_____

THANK YOU!

Please return to: Joyce Duncan Falk, Library - Reference
University of California, Irvine
P. O. Box 19557, Irvine, CA 92713